ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
Department of Land Management

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
August 10th, 2016 9:00 AM
COUNTY BOARD ROOM

Chairman Brandt called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.

Roll Call of Committee members took place. Committee members present: George Brandt, Beth Killian, Jeff Bawek, Wade Britzius, Aaron Kidd, Curt Skoyen, Kathy Zeglin.

Staff/Advisors present: Kevin Lien, Becky Arneson and Jake Budish. DLM Staff members Mark Carlson, Ann Hempel, Corporation Counsel Rian Radtke and Attorney Aaron Graf were present for only part of the meeting.

Others present: Whitney McDougal-Saxe, Mike Miller, Ashley Slaby, Jeff Hauser, Justin Happel, Jeri Harper, Christina Brommerich , Danny Foote, Wava Jacobchik, Douglas Stegerwald, Charlotte Everson, Tom Forrer, Luke Kramer, and Attorney John Behling.

Brandt verified that the Open Meeting Law requirements had been complied with through notifications and posting.

Adoption of Agenda - Britzius made a motion to approve the amended agenda, Bawek seconded. Brandt informed the Committee that Corporation Counsel Rian Radtke wishes to be present for agenda item #10 and he is somewhat constrained by a court appearance at 10:00 AM and he was asking that the Committee schedule that for 10:30AM. The insurance company attorney who is advising the Committee on that issue will be here at 10:30 AM. Motion to approve revised agenda carried with no opposition.

Adoption of Minutes
Zeglin made a motion to approve the July 13th, 2016 regular meeting minutes, Britzius seconded. Killian made some minor corrections to the minutes. Motion to approve the amended meeting minutes carried with no opposition. Bawek made a motion to approve the special meeting minutes from March 29th, 2016, Kidd seconded. Motion to approve the meeting minutes passed with no opposition. Killian abstained from the approval of these minutes because she was not at the meeting as she had not yet been appointed to the County Board.

NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service) Update – Rian Swatek from NRCS was not present but he did forward the following information to Lien. Lien informed the Committee that NRCS held a work group in July and are in the process of determining percentages of funds and practices that will be high priority. They are now in the process of sending out deferral letters to all EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentive Program) applicants that did not get funding in 2016. Those applicants will have the option to either cancel or retain their applications for 2017. Currently, NRCS is taking EQIP applications for 2017 until September 2nd which is the cutoff date for funding for 2017. From September 2nd through December 2nd, 2016 they will be working on getting those applications to high priority status in order to give them the best chance for funding. Those applications will be ranked in late December and hopefully will have contracts signed in January. CRP is a big work load right now. They have already signed up 94 contracts in 2016 with 20 more to go by the October 1st start date. They have 120 applicants who have expressed interest in the HELI (Highly Erodible Land Initiative) continuous CRP sign up. CSP (Conservation Stewardship Program) process of collecting documentation for current contractors continues. No date has been set for 2017 sign-up. They have also had a few HELI and

wetland violations in the County that they are dealing with. Those producers are going through an appeals process. Swatek sent his apologies for not making the meeting but said that covering two counties is a constant challenge. Brandt commented that the Committee appreciates the information they receive from Swatek and look forward to seeing Swatek next month.

Public Hearing - Land Use Change/Rezone - Transitional Agriculture (TA) to Residential – 20 (R-20), Olga Missell Revocable Living Trust –Landowner, Phillip D. Junghans, Alternate Trustee - Petitioner, Onalaska, WI - Town of Trempealeau

Chairman Brandt informed the public present of the public hearing procedures. Brandt called the public hearing to order at 9:10AM. Killian read the public hearing notice aloud. Brandt acknowledged Luke Kramer who was present. Kramer stated he was here with the landowner. Carlson explained that currently the parcel is zoned transitional Ag and they wish to develop the area so it does need to be rezoned to Residential-20 (R-20). Carlson said that was pretty consistent with the zoning in the surrounding areas. Carlson pointed out the zoning of the area on the overhead aerial map. Carlson stated he received an e-mail this morning that Phillip Junghans actually owns the property now. Kramer commented that his impression was that Mike Miller actually owns the property now as that transaction happened a couple of weeks ago. Kramer stated the paperwork wasn't established correctly to begin with so they had to transfer ownership from the trust to the successor and then from the successor to the landowner, but according to Kramer that has all been resolved so that Mike Miller is the current owner. Carlson said he has a letter from the township. Carlson has not received any correspondence from neighboring property owners. Carlson added that one gentleman that lives in Mountain View Lane had called for information and Carlson has heard nothing after that. Carlson reiterated that the new zoning would be consistent with other property in the area. Lien stated the Town Land Use Plan also called for R-20 zoning.
Luke Kramer stated he is with High Cliff Consulting. High Cliff did the design and engineering on the project. Kramer explained that the property is going to be developed into residential lots. The name of the project is called Canar Pines. It is roughly going to be divided into 22 lots. Kramer said it has been checked and it meets with the County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, i.e. frontages, lot density, etc. has all been checked into. Kramer said they have done some storm water work on the site. The site is pretty sandy so there is actually not a lot of runoff to worry about containing. Kramer has calc's that show the collection area planned for the site can hold a 400 hundred year event. In terms of the trees, it is currently a cultivated pine forest that has been sitting there for some time without a harvest. According to Kramer, the plan is to keep a lot of the trees there and remove only the trees necessary to get the road in and clear out lots for construction. Any other trees that are moved unnecessarily will be planted back because the idea is to preserve the pines. Kramer said the road has been checked by the Town of Trempealeau and it meets all of their requirements. The plan is for the Town of Trempealeau to adopt that as a town road which will be called Canar Pines Drive. The cul-de-sac, the storm water plan and the resurfacing all meets Town of Trempealeau requirements. Brandt called for any public testimony.

Jeri Harper – Registered to testify in opposition. Harper stated she is new to all this and she has questions about water quality when putting in that many wells and septic systems in that area. When she moved in there were fields and pastures and there were a couple (3) other developments going there. She has questions about wells and septic's, and water quality. She had questions about the development, how big the lots were. Harper said it is a beautiful area and the people that live around there love it for the natural beauty. She doesn't own it so she doesn't have a lot of say but there is a lot of wildlife in those pines. There are probably other people here that probably don't want to speak but feel that same way. Brandt commented Harper was raising issues that the Committee needs to be discussing.

Christina and Jason Brommerich- Registered in opposition but not testify**.**

Brandt called for any other public testimony**.** Carlson read a letter from the Town of Gale dated June 16th, 2016 which stated this letter is in reference to a request from Mike Miller to rezone property and the approval of the

preliminary plat of Canar Pines development. The Town of Trempealeau Board has no objection to the rezoning of the property from Trans. Ag. to Residential-20 and approves the preliminary plat. Brandt called for any other public testimony. There being none, Brandt closed the public hearing at 9:19 AM. Britzius made a motion to approve, Skoyen seconded. Brandt asked if Lien or Carlson wanted to address any of the issues that were brought up. Carlson stated that as far as the septic's go, everything is designed according to what the soil types are and they have to maintain a minimum of three feet of separation. It depends on the soil type as far as what the system is. There are a few subdivisions in that area and as of right now there are no "red flags" as to it being a detriment. Wells and septic's are being developed through the standards of the Department of Safety and Professional Services. It is a concern but it isn't one that the County can guarantee the safety of it one way or the other. The wells are drilled and the septic's are constructed to a certain standard that needs to be met. Brandt commented there are issues of water down there but it has more to do with agriculture than residential. Carlson agreed. Carlson added that in Prairie Wood Estates or Buckskin there have been no complaints or no tests pointing to anything going wrong with people's wells in those areas. Britzius asked if the wells are being drilled very deep down there. Carlson responded that because of the sand there are a lot of in-ground systems being put in. There are no requirement for Mounds, etc., but Carlson said that could vary. Just because it is sandy that means the water goes through it quicker. Brandt stated the other issue had to do with aesthetics. Carlson stated there is a similar subdivision off of Delaney Road called Red Pines and River Pines. They have kind of done that where they have basically created homes in the middle of the forest. Carlson thought this development would be something similar to that as Kramer was talking about them wanting to maintain the trees. As far as wildlife it will be disturbed but it should be able to adapt. Brandt thought Carlson was referring to the road that goes to Elmaro Farms. Carlson said it was talked about a little this morning as to what the reason was that the area was all pine trees. There were questions as to if there were water or rock issues but Carlson thought perhaps the person just wanted to plant pine trees. Carlson added that really has nothing to do with the rezone but it would come out in soil testing for the septic's, etc. Budish displayed an overhead aerial photo of the Red Pine and River Pine Road development which Carlson had referred to. Britzius asked if it was a mature planting of trees and are they going to start dying soon. Kramer said he has seen some downed timber there and they are very mature trees. Kramer was sure a lot of them might be nearing the end of their life. Kramer added it was a cultivated forest so that the trees were planted there for harvest. In discussion about covenants, Kramer said the covenants are being drafted and have not been finalized yet. Kramer didn't know if there was any language in there about the trees. Kramer knew that there were certain easement areas that the people are not allowed to touch/develop on their own, mostly for utility or storm water purposes. Kramer did know that preserving the character of the pine trees in the area is important so Kramer imagined there would be language in there for preserving those pine trees in the final draft of the covenants. As a suggestion for the covenants, Lien asked Kramer to encourage community wells where one well services multiple homes because in this area we know that if you're north of the Mississippi between Trempealeau and Black River it is not a water quantity issue but there is water quality issues in this area, where if there were deeper, better quality wells, that service multiple homes it would probably be a benefit to the people in the subdivision. Kramer said that was something they had discussed in the past in considering this project. Since there is a cul-de-sac at the end of the road, Bawek asked if this would be a cluster type development or what size will the lots be (inaudible). Kramer responded the majority of the lots range in size from an acre and a half to a little over two acres. Kramer thought there were one or two that get larger than that. Kramer said Mike Miller was very clear he didn't want any lots less than an acre and a half as he was trying to avoid that cluster type development. Kramer said there actually is that Town of Trempealeau requirement that you're not allowed to have more than three driveways off of a cul-de-sac so to be on the safe side and to give those people on the end lots a little bit more room, they actually only put two at the end of the cul-de-sac. Kramer added they aren't that tightly packed in there, they appear to be good sized, usable lots. Bawek asked if there was a buffer to surround the area or specifications so they can't build right up to the property line. Kramer responded there are setback requirements in the County Ordinance. Carlson added the County only has a 10 foot setback for a home. There could be a covenant where they could require a couple of rows of pine trees to block the neighboring home. Upon Bawek asking if that would be exceeding County regulations, Kramer

said it does meet or exceed. Bawek asked how many acres were undevelopable because of power lines and the drainage area. Bawek asked if any of it was a community area. Kramer responded it is pretty close to fully developed. Kramer pointed out the CAP X easement and that there are three lots below that (which have been relabeled in a most recent draft) that are part of a separate CSM (Certified Survey Map)(They thought it would be easier to do it that way in the long run) that are also part of that development as well. Kramer stated it is pretty much reaching full development. Since this is a pine plantation, Zeglin asked if it was enrolled in the MFL (Managed Forest Land) program. Kramer said it has not been. Zeglin verified that the road has been agreed to and accepted by the Town of Trempealeau. Kramer said the Town agreed to take it over as long as we made good on our word to build it to town specs. Motion to approve the rezone passed with no opposition. Brandt informed Miller that the rezone will need to go to County Board for final approval.

Public Hearing - Land Use Change/Rezone - Primary Agriculture (PA) to Commercial (C)
Justin D. Happel, Landowner/Petitioner, Holmen, WI – Town of Caledonia

Chairman Brandt opened the public hearing at 9:31 AM. Killian read the public hearing notice aloud. Brandt acknowledged Justin Happel who was present. Carlson stated Happel wants to construct a new shop for his trucks and equipment. The zoning varies in the area from Primary Ag to R-20. There is a property on the corner of County Road K and County Road M that was zoned Commercial which used to be a gas station. Carlson said Happel had plans for the commercial building. Carlson has a letter from the Town of Caledonia. Carlson did not receive any response from the public. Carlson added Happel needs to have the building zoned commercial for what he wants to use it for. Only the footprint of the building is being rezoned. Lien said the Town of Caledonia has a long history of that type of zoning as they don't want to see outside storage area for these commercial properties so they keep it to the footprint of the building. Carlson said there is a home and another building on the site now. Happel stated he wants to build a shop to store three commercial vehicles, tractors and have a small office space. He has State approved plans and it meets all the commercial specs. Happel added the Town of Caledonia suggested going for a rezone in case it is built and then someone doesn't like seeing the trucks coming in and out, therefore it is zoned commercial (inaudible). Brandt called for any public testimony a number of times. Carlson read a letter dated April 12th, 2016 from the Town of Caledonia which stated that on March 15th, 2016 at the towns' regular meeting, Corey Feyen made a motion to approve the permit and the rezone. The footprint of the building is a 60' X 80' pole building. Joe Jablonski seconded, motion carried. Brandt closed the public hearing at 9:37AM. Killian made a motion to approve the rezone, Britzius seconded. Brandt asked if Happel would be using the other buildings as well? Happel said the only other buildings on the site were Happel's house and garage. The other building nearby was an old gas station. The location of Happel's building was clarified on the overhead aerial photo as well as where his house and garage were located. Carlson stated the line of site is good as far as trucks entering and exiting the driveway. Britzius asked Happel to briefly describe his business. Happel explained he owns a septic pumping company, Holmen Pumping, so he has three trucks, usually one or two trucks are run every day. They go in and out every day because they have DNR approved fields that they can spread on so they go out to spread waste right now. (Some inaudible discussion). Zeglin asked about employees and if there would be a restroom facility in the building. Happel responded it is just family but there will be a small office space in there with a handicap accessible bathroom with all the state requirements. Upon Bawek asking who David and Patricia Happel were, Justin responded they were his parents and that they own the field around him. Motion to approve passed with no opposition. Brandt informed Happel that the rezone would need to go to County Board for final approval.

Public Hearing – Conditional Use Permit & Reclamation Permit for Non-Metallic Mining-Construction Aggregate Pit - Jerome & Cynthia Hanson, Blair, WI, Property Owner/Applicants & Hegg Contractors, Ettrick, WI & Tri-City Sanitation, Whitehall, WI – Operators/Applicants – Town of Preston

Chairman Brandt opened the public hearing at 9:45 AM. Killian read the public hearing notice aloud. Whitney McDougal-Saxe introduced herself stating she was present to represent Hegg Contractors, David Pientok- Tri-City Sanitation, Jeremiah Pientok-Tri-City Sanitation, and Jerome Hanson-property owner introduced

themselves. Budish stated this is a construction aggregate site that is going to be 6 acres mined with a total footprint of 15 acres for the purpose of capping and the lining of Tri-City Sanitation land fill. They intend to have the majority of the site extracted within one years' time and capping it and putting it back into the field. They may just have a small area open for doing maintenance at the land fill. This also being a reclamation hearing, Brandt asked Budish to describe the reclamation. Budish stated the post reclamation for the site will be back into agricultural grassland. Post reclamation can be seen on Figure 7 which was included in the packet. Final slides and slopes of the reclaimed area will resemble existing topography. As Budish understood, this site was used back in 1989 when they initially extracted material out of there for the purpose of using it for Tri-City Sanitation. Both horizons are going to be separated so there are no issues on Budish's part. Brandt asked Dave Pientok if he was a part of this the first time they used this pit. D. Pientok made a correction by saying that in 1989 the site was used to cap the City of Blair land fill. D. Pientok said the major landscaping is strictly to remove the topsoil, extract the clay and put it back so that the landowners can use the land for a hay field and corn field. Pientok's goal, once permitted, is to have this done in 6 months. They want to get the amount out for the clay liner right away and get everything put back together so that the hay field can be put back into service. Over winter they would probably haul out the clay for the capping of the land fill so the site would be back together and ready for planting time. Jeremiah Pientok added they are trying to keep it to a short window as they don't want to have it open any longer then they have to and it is going back to the agricultural land as it was. D. Pientok stated Hegg Contractors has been hired to do the approved work for the clay borrow site and at the land fill. Hanson stated that in 1989 the clay was extracted and the land was reclaimed. Hanson didn't think one could go out there now and see the mine site as they wouldn't know where it was. As far as Hanson knew, he said the condition of the land is as good as what it was before this started. McDougal-Saxe stated the roadway that they are going to be turning into is on Schansberg Road which is access for the site, they're doing Type C, so that means they will be doing 50 loads a day maximum.

Wava Jacobchik – Registered to testify for information only. Jacobchik said they have land that is somewhat adjacent to this. She said the questions she was going to ask are pretty much answered. Upon her inquiry as to that the pit would be open less than a year, D. Pientok responded less than that hopefully. Jacobchik stated she wasn't aware that there had been a mine in that area before. The response from the room was that it was not a mine but a borrow site but in 1989 the requirements were different than what they are now. To answer Jacobchik's questions, D. Pientok explained they go down 4-6 feet or as deep as they can. The goal is to knock out a couple of the knolls for the landowner to make it easier for farming. After they take the clay out, they reverse the process with the overburden and put the topsoil back on. In looking at the map that shows the road, Jacobchik asked if it was a road going out onto the highway. D. Pientok said that was correct and clarified that there was a 50 load maximum per day. Jacobchik asked about the hours of operation. D. Pientok said they would be normal business hours. Brandt said there were limitations to hours of operation with every mining permit. (There was some inaudible discussion as multiple people were talking).

Town of Preston Board Member -Charlotte Everson – Registered to testify in favor. Everson stated we (Town of Preston) had a special meeting only because the first time this was brought to the Town of Preston Board it was stated as approval of a nonmetallic mining site and it wasn't specified that it was actually a clay borrowing site so, of course, within our town everybody was like, "Oh no, not another sand mine", but Everson said she talked to a lot of old timers after our first tabling of this issue and they stated that this was actually kind of a special red clay called Lafayette red clay. There is only a few areas within our township that have this type of clay. This was something that was done on the farm years ago. It is in a perfect location to go onto a road that has the correct access and visual specifications – it can be seen from both ways. Everson said we do hope that it will have a decent driveway put in which is part of the Chapter 13 requirements anyway. Time was something that was talked about which is great that it will get done within a time frame. At this point, Brandt clarified that Everson was talking as a member of the Town of Preston Board. Everson said yes, and added that these were items that were discussed at the town meeting. Everson said they didn't have the finalized plan, which was fine, and within the finalized plan she thought it actually states a year. Their discussion actually was

that if it wasn't able to get done, we would certainly want this project to be done because it is capping a land fill so this is an environmentally good thing all around. Everson said it was approved at the special meeting. They didn't hear from members of the public and the press even missed the special meeting so it is nice to hear that the Town of Preston folks are coming to find out more about it. In the future, Everson said the town board will try to make these type of requests easier for the applicant and the town's people to find out what is going on. Everson added that the Town of Preston Board is in favor of this project. Brandt called for any other public testimony twice.

Budish stated he had two letters from the Town of Preston Board. One was received July 18th, 2016 and it stated that the Town of Preston Board will meet on July 25th, 2016 at 1:00 PM to take action on the request to do a nonmetallic mining pit for clay borrowing on the Joe and Cindy Hanson family farm. Budish received another letter from the Town of Preston Board on July 25th, 2016 which stated the Town of Preston board conducted a special meeting on July 25th, 2016 at 1: 00 PM. C. Everson made a motion to approve the clay borrow site, Darrel Nelson seconded, motion passed. Budish had one person who wished to remain anonymous and was an adjacent landowner who had a couple of questions. They just had questions as to what was going to go there. Once Budish clarified the size, duration, etc., they said they had no issues with the site. According to Budish they were very pleased with the duration of the site and they were also very surprised that there was mining that took place there as one can't tell anything took place there. Budish said this turned out to be a little more complex than Budish thought. Since we have the authority to notify persons who may have a concern beyond the adjacent landowners, Budish reached out to some landowners from Brekke Ridge because they may be able to see it. When Budish contacted Northern States Power Company, there are a number of entities that actually get involved because there are a bunch of easements as there are transmission lines around there. There is one to the northwest and another one to the southeast line. The Northwest line is owned by Dairyland and they have an easement within 50 feet of each side of the transmission lines. Excel Energy owns a line there and also in the proposed Badger Coulee transmission line, that line will come within 300 feet of the proposed site. After clarification and talking with all entities, they said there is no issue except with the haul route. Budish said he would address that when he goes through the conditions. Other than that, Budish said they are very pleased that everything is going to be moving very efficiently and close like that. Budish sent an e-mail to the City of Whitehall on July 27th, 2016 informing them that the haul routes for the trucks would be through the City of Whitehall. Budish said he didn't get any response from the City as of yet. Brandt asked if the trucks weren't going through Schansberg Road. Budish replied that was an alternate route. Budish had talked to the Highway Commissioner about the condition of the Wade Road bridge. Budish stated that bridge is constructed to have the specs that will handle empty or full quad axle trucks, if it ever came to that. That bridge is designed for a 20,000 pound load limit beyond the normal town road. Budish also has a condition in regard to that. Brandt called for any other public testimony. There being none, closed the public hearing at 10:03AM. Bawek made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit and Reclamation Permit for nonmetallic mining-construction aggregate pit for the Jerome and Cynthia Hanson, Blair, WI property, Schultz seconded. Budish handed out some staff recommendations for conditions to the Committee. Brandt read the conditions aloud:

- When the owner/operator decides to haul the material from J&C Family Farms, LLC clay site, all trucks leaving must be tarped/covered
- If owner/operator decides to haul on the proposed alternate route, the owner/operator must notify the Town of Preston & Department of Land Management.
- The proposed roadway fill, that crosses the Dairyland Power highline easement, must not exceed 2 foot of fill from the existing ground elevation without the prior, written consent of Dairyland Power Cooperative.

Budish stated that condition came about through an e-mail correspondence with Dairyland Power. Budish didn't know what the significance is of two feet of fill within the existing ground. J. Pientok said he talked to them (Excel and Dairyland) a little bit on the phone and what their concern was is that they keep a minimum distance between transmission lines and the ground and they are set so that if we were to go more than two feet

then we might start getting into that distance gap but we shouldn't have any problem as we are just putting a temporary road across there to travel on. Budish added it will be built to the same specs as a stone tracking pad. Budish commented these conditions are pretty much the same as everybody else. Budish read the following "preliminary" condition which stated:

- No hauling will commence until access approval off of USH 53 from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

Budish said he just got word from the Hegg Contractors representative that they just received approval and are putting in Type C, so this preliminary condition could possibly be struck if the Committee wished to do so. Lien asked McDougal-Saxe if she could expand on the Type C and whether that had a turn lane or not or because it is just 50 loads per day that you wouldn't have to add that. (Inaudible text) Lien confirmed they didn't have to add the turn lane. Lien reminded the Committee that because this is a Conditional Use Permit, in the past there have been some conditions that included no staging- especially on a State highway and that the trucking company should correlate with school bus times for pick-up and drop-off so that we don't have any incidents. Brandt added there are standard conditions related to hours of operation. Lien agreed and said those all apply. Brandt noted that this is a reclamation permit hearing as well so if there are any questions related to the reclamation plan those should be addressed. Budish said he had no conditions in regard to the reclamation plan and that was based on their prior success with the site and their detail and how fast they wish to go through and re-establish and seed. Budish added we are going to put financial assurance on this site. That is standard for NR-135 based on the size of it. Budish stated that Chapter 13 and Chapter 20 of our Ordinance more than exceed the standards and cover the entire site. Budish said, since we've been doing it as a standard, the duration of the Conditional Use Permit will be five years. They wish to have it done within one year. Budish added these conditions are pretty much the same as everyone else and they are preliminary. Brandt recapped that we have a motion and a second to approve. We have recommendations for five/six conditions. Some discussion occurred. (A lot of it was inaudible). Some discussion took place about the conditions. Schultz made a motion to include the conditions in the Conditional Use Permit, Britzius seconded. Zeglin clarified that also included the information about the school bus and the staging. Zeglin asked what the standard hours of operation were that will be imposed. Budish responded the standard hours of operation are in Chapter 13. Lien added it is 6:00AM-8:00 PM Monday thru Friday, 7:00 AM -3:00PM Saturday with no Sundays or Holidays. Lien said one of the things that is a success and that we've heard today is that several people in the community did not realize there had been a borrow pit there. Lien voiced that was a really good thing. Kidd said he was a little surprised himself because he has worked with Joe for the last 20 plus years putting his crops in and taking them off. Bawek mentioned that in the pamphlet it talks about putting a foot of subsoil and a foot of topsoil and asked if Budish had a verifiable way to guarantee that is going to happen. Budish replied that once the contractor reaches that stage of doing that portion of reclamation, he encourages them to contact Budish so he can go out there and do verification of that standard which they will be following through reclamation. Bawek clarified that Budish will have what is written in here. Budish responded that when they are ready they usually give Budish a call or send an e-mail and he'll make time to get out there and verify it. Budish said he also went out to the site to try and figure out where the site was at one time based on the map. According to Budish one can't tell where the footprint of it was. Budish didn't have any photos and it's all crops right now so one can't even tell where it is/was. Bawek clarified that no one was asking for the standard five year permit and that they are asking for one. Bawek asked if we are staying with the standard five year condition/permit. Budish responded he was just staying consistent. Since Budish has started here the nonmetallic mining permits have always been about five years with an automatic two year renewal. They wish to only do it one year but Budish is allowing them the flexibility because if there was a "hiccup" or something then they would have to go through this process again and also to stay consistent with other permits. Bawek commented that perhaps for the sake of the neighbors two years is enough. Budish replied it is up to the applicant as they have said the majority of the hauling will take place within three weeks and they reach 50 loads per day they can get a lot done. Upon Lien asking Dave Pientok how he felt about that and if two years would be enough of a window, D. Pientok responded he agrees with Budish on this in keeping it at five years, in case something would happen when they get to the capping part, if they have to stockpile the capping material until they get to capping the

landfill and we find out we're 500 yards short, then we may have to come back and re-apply. D. Pientok said he would like to keep it at five years and if they get done early, then they get done early. Lien stated there would be a bond on this site as there always is for anything over an acre through NR-135. They don't get the bond back until the reclamation is complete so it is in their best interest to reclaim. This would leave it so that they would have that five year window without having to come back. Bawek asked to hear from the neighbor that spoke to the issue of time as to how she feels about that. Jacobchik said the only reservation that she would have is that they have two properties that they are renovating for resale and it is a very area, open to the public to view, we might run into resale problems. (Inaudible comments). D. Pientok suggested meeting in the middle and go three years as they expect to have this all done in less than a year- hopefully in six months everything is back in place just like it is now and you won't even know we were there. Brandt clarified that D. Pientok would be good with three years. D. Pientok responded if it would make life easier for folks, yes. Jacobchik stated our resale isn't going to be up for another year. Brandt asked if Schultz would be willing to change his motion from five years to three years. Schultz agreed and Britzius who seconded the motion, also agreed. Bawek said one point that he got out of Everson's talk was that the Town of Preston approved this on the basis of the shorter length of time. Bawek wanted to clarify that was true. Everson stated that was a focal point of their discussion and it was stated for a year and we were going to say, if they couldn't get it done within that year, that we would be open to extend it and we were going to make that part of our condition but then we were told that already is a condition in their final draft which we did not have a copy of. Everson said a one year time line was something that they (Town of Preston Board) had considered. Everson said to look at what has happened to the Town of Preston on nonmetallic mining. At this point we would have a site that is open to nonmetallic mining, by definition of what it is, even though it is a clay borrowing site. Budish stated this is the duration of the Conditional Use, the reclamation plan itself states it is going to be within one year. Budish said he was just allowing the flexibility of the CUP for them to go with. Zeglin commented if the reclamation plan does state one year, she didn't see any reason to extend the Conditional Use Permit for more than one year. Zeglin said their plan stated they would be done in a year. If they need an extension then they can come back. Zeglin added that personally she was very uncomfortable with the five years. Everything in the plan says one year, they stated one year and Zeglin said she would like to stick to that with them coming back for an extension if they need to. Lien added we allow for an extension of two years so if they are granted a year and they can't get it done they just come back before the Committee (not a public hearing) and ask for an extension for two years which would basically give them three years. Upon Brandt asking Dave Pientok if he was good with that, Pientok responded yes. Brandt clarified with Schultz and Britzius and they agreed that the permit would be for one year with the two year automatic extension. Brandt recapped that the conditions that are on the floor are the three recommended by Budish and the two from Lien related to staging and school buses and changing the standard five year permit length to one year with a two year extension upon request. Zeglin stated the reclamation plan calls for the use to go back to Ag grassland and a hayfield and corn was mentioned. Some discussion took place about the future plantings/reclamation on the site. Brandt asked Budish to "weigh-in" on reclamation possibilities related to that. Budish said they have to achieve 70% cover regardless and the grass land will be more than satisfactory. Budish added he will hold the applicant to that and Budish can also hold on to the financial assurance until they go back to what is desired, as the landowner wishes to go back to soybeans. Budish said the landowner has the final say beyond owner and operator. Brandt asked if the field will be stable enough to plant soybeans. Lien commented that because of the duration, if it is only a year you're not going to lose soil fertility or have sterile soil in that minimal amount of time where Lien thought he could achieve a good row crop within that period. Lien thought if it would be stripped for a longer period of time and stockpiled you might lose some soil fertility there. To answer Zeglin's question, Lien said in the past we have required sod cover – 70% of the yield. More discussion took place on crops/yields. Zeglin commented if they wanted to put in soybeans their plan should have said that. Budish replied that we would then have to modify our duration of the Conditional Use Permit if she wants to make it another year to go with this number. Britzius inquired about modifying the plan to which Lien told Britzius that they could as it is a Conditional Use. Lien added we are are really talking about two different things here, one is a conditional use permit the other is a reclamation permit. Lien said the Conditional Use Permit could be for reclamation ongoing after the project because until it meets

the reclamation requirements it still is valid even though the Conditional use Permit may lapse, so if the Committee wanted to make that a condition that it meet 70% crop production that would allow them the option of either doing grass or a row crop but we wouldn't release the bond until it met that. Lien added that from what Aaron Kidd had said it would be easy to meet. Zeglin suggested establishing that as a condition. Britzius made an amendment to the reclamation permit so that it read "general ag" as opposed to specifically "grassland", Zeglin seconded the motion. Brandt noted that the Committee has five conditions that will be approved in relation to the Conditional Use Permit and then we will vote on the conditional use permit. Lien reviewed the conditions as being three standard ones recommended by staff. And then Schultz made a motion and Britzius seconded that there be no staging on the public roadway, to take into account school bus timing and hauling and change the length of the mine permit from five year down to one year with acknowledgement of Section 13.03 and the possibility of a two year extension and to allow for either 70% sod cover or 70% yield of a row crop before releasing the bond. In regard to the road use, Zeglin asked Everson from the Town of Preston if they discussed possible repairs at all or are they satisfied. Everson responded the only road they saw this plan going on is directly onto State Highway 53. When something about Schansberg Road came up with the Town of Preston, Everson said her understanding was it was in the Town of Lincoln and not in the Town of Preston Schansberg Road even though the City/these guys haul on Carpenter Bridge to get out of there but that is not part of the hauling for Tri-City Sanitation. Hegg Contracting uses/drives on Schansberg Road and Carpenter Bridge but that is a totally separate issue. Everson said she didn't understand what would need to be discussed with the Town of Preston. Someone said they opted not to use any Town of Preston roads so we're going to turn onto US Hwy 53 and our route takes us through the City of Whitehall and through the Town of Lincoln. Everson added it was a little concerning to her when she saw the Town of Preston on the plan because if the Committee approves this and they do take an alternate route, they never discussed an alternate route with the Town of Preston. Dave Pientok said he sees no need to use the Town of Preston. D. Pientok said the trucks that go to the land fill now, on a state approved route, are coming through the City of Whitehall and going onto Schansberg Road up by the trailer court and into the landfill. It is a simple, easy route. Budish commented the reason he put the Town of Preston is because that is where the location of the site is. Everson stated none of the roads actually affect the Town of Preston because it is State Highway 53. Zeglin stated she would, at least, like a letter to go to the Town of Lincoln on this since they haven't been notified at all of the extra traffic on their town road. Brandt said that is all City of Whitehall out there. Lien commented it is all City of Whitehall as long as they don't use the alternate route. Budish said he could and Brandt instructed him to clarify the condition so instead of just notifying the Town of Preston, he could say notify the "towns" and that would include whoever is involved/affected. Britzius and Schultz agreed to add that to the condition. Brandt stated the discussion has pointed out not only what a small footprint this is, short duration time, value to the community, etc. but Brandt expressed appreciation for Ayres for putting together a really good pamphlet and making sure that the Conditional Use Permit application was complete. Britzius asked if Tri-City was expanding the land fill. D. Pientok explained the site is 200,000 cubic yards. We did the first half, Phase 1, and now we're doing the second half, Phase 2. They have to put a 3 foot clay liner and he detailed a lot of the stuff that they put in there and then when they close the land fill then they have to go through a process of putting a two foot clay layer, a top layer and that is what the clay is for. The stockpiling will not occur on the Hanson property as it will be hauled out to the site and stockpiled there, so D. Pientok said he didn't spend a lot of time on the reclamation as that is going to go quick. D. Pientok added the land fill is for construction and demolition only so there is no household municipal solid waste as that goes to Eau Claire and LaCrosse. Britzius clarified the land fill isn't increasing its' footprint at all. Hanson said we are increasing it in the aspect of the first part, when it was originally designed, it was 200,000 yards and we only did about 100,000 of it, we dug the second part but we didn't put the clay in, so this is the final capacity. Motion to approve the conditions recommended by staff and clarified by Committee members passed with no opposition. Motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with the conditions just approved passed with no opposition. At this time the Committee took a five minute recess. At this time, Aaron Kidd left the meeting.

At 10:44 AM, Brandt called the meeting to order. The Committee moved to agenda item #10. **Procedure for**

appeal of Environment & Land Use Committee's "activity" decision. Brandt noted that the Committee has asked Attorney Aaron Graf to give advice on an issue that was raised at the last meeting related to the appeal process. Brandt asked Graf to review where the Committee was at with this issue. Graf stated at the last meeting there was the issue/question regarding the appeal procedure if a party was unhappy with an "activity" decision made by the E & LU Committee. Graf said we did an opinion letter of which everyone should have received a copy of that. Graf said he was not going to discuss the contents of that letter simply because it is an attorney/client privilege, however if someone would like to discuss it afterward he would be happy to do so, but you obviously have his (Graf's) recommendation and analysis regarding what the Zoning Ordinance says and how to possibly proceed from here. Graf said, today, if the Committee can it would be good to give Spartan Sands some direction as to the appeal process if they are not happy with an eventual decision. Brandt stated that Graf's recommendation as he recalls was to basically say we don't have a process in place. This is something we haven't dealt with in the past so we haven't made any arrangements for an appeal. Brandt thought what we've also stated is that this is somewhat of a "hybrid" appeal process other than what we usually hear, hearing elements from a Conditional Use Permit process, a de novo hearing/quasi-judicial hearing and then the recommendation was basically a Chapter 68 review if Spartan Sands isn't satisfied with the results of the "activity" hearing, so that would be based on what is available. Zeglin stated she took a look at Chapter 13 also and she said there didn't seem to be any internal administrative review outlined for this particular appeal. Zeglin made a motion to refer Spartan Sands lawyers to State Statute Chapter 68 for a procedure. Upon Brandt asking if a motion was appropriate at this time, Graf responded yes. Bawek seconded the motion. Britzius commented in order to clarify that some of the language we're using is confusing in that we are already engaged in the appeal process, or we did have an appeal process in the Ordinance and we're doing that now, so what we're talking about now is an appeal to an appeal or something like that. Britzius congratulated the people who came before him that did set up an appeal process. Schultz asked if this motion applies to anyone else who would challenge this decision not just Spartan Sands. Graf responded that was right that it would apply to any activity decision under Chapter 13 where there doesn't appear to be an internal process. (Some inaudible comments took place). Motion to approve Zeglin's motion passed with no opposition.

Conservation Aids –Arneson stated there is just one application for Conservation Aids which the Committee has before them. Arneson explained Conservation Aids money is guaranteed to the County, we just need to have an actual, viable plan/application that will go with whatever the DNR would request of us. A request from the DNR is that whatever is being done has public access and in regards to either a fishery or wildlife or anything that would happen to be in their spectrum of what they would like to see done. We seem to have a couple of Rod & Gun Clubs that alternate every year. Last year it was the Elk Rod & Gun Club and what we have before us now is an application from the Ettrick Rod & Gun Club. They are putting in place an archery range. They are talking about 20 practice bunker targets at a cost of roughly $9,900.00. Obviously the grant would not be for that amount as the grant is only approved for $1,971.00 as it is every year. The County can apply for additional funds. Arneson went through the application with the Committee. Arneson said Ettrick Rod & Gun Club plans to have safety classes for archery once this is all put into place. Arneson said it is a matching grant, we get them the $1,971.00 and the Club has to match that. Arneson said DNR has approved this grant already. Some discussion took place on the project. Lien clarified that the County only gets what the grant is for and it is non-levy dollars. Lien said typically we get the grant every year. Schultz asked if we, as a County could use this to get money for a canoe landing to which Arneson replied yes, as long as there is actual public access and within the scope of the grant it could come forward and be put in front of the Committee for approval. Arneson and Lien clarified the application deadline for the grant is August 1st. Some discussion took place on the additional money that the County is applying for. Arneson explained that later in the year if any other County has not used their funds, Trempealeau County can apply for those funds which explains the extra $500 grant amount and the Club would have to match that amount also if awarded to our County. Skoyen made a motion to approve the distribution of the grant funds, Zeglin seconded, motion to approve passed with no opposition.

Discuss Parks, Tourism & Economic Development status and direction of County Parks

Schultz stated our Department staff has been handling the bulk of the management of the County Parks. According to Schultz, the full County Board, at one point, had considered taking the County parks and putting them under the Property Committee and after a couple of meetings it was decided there would be a Parks, Tourism & Economic Development Committee and in the interim Department staff would oversee the parks. Schultz said we are still in an "interim" status at this point in terms of creating a budget, finding staff, etc. We are still moving forward with the Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee to continue to have Department staff to manage the park so we have to come to an understanding how that is going to develop. Lien stated that basically at the last Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee they made a motion that instead of it being an "interim" one year period for the parks, tourism and economic development to be under the Department of Land Management, to make that a permanent addition with its own separate budget and with some additional staff and to specifically look into hiring an economics and tourism director/coordinator and then two part-time positions which would be perhaps summer positions to manage the park itself. Along with that, the County is looking at possibly getting additional public lands that could be utilized for a park. There is a tour coming up next week. Potentially, Lien said it could be a bigger work load. Brandt asked what the purpose would be of having a Committee for Parks, Tourism and Economic Development if all of the work is being done under the auspices of the Department of Land Management. Brandt questioned what the role of the Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee would be, because you would, in essence, be overseeing work that is being overseen by another Committee. Schultz responded that, first of all the Parks, Tourism & Economic Development meetings have not been short and secondly, at this point they have decided to hire personnel which would be a "wing" under the DLM. In some way, Schultz thought it is segregating Committee duties. Schultz said Brandt is raising a good point or do we just expand the purpose of this Committee and dissolve the other one. Brandt commented that in some County's this is the most important committee (Park, Tourism & Economic Development) there is. Brandt thought there is a number of ways to look at this; one is don't sell yourself short in what the amount of work it is to just managing the parks, but also how broad the picture can become with economic development and tourism. Brandt reads the minutes to the meetings and it is clear that there is a lot of stuff going on and that the Committee could be a vital part of finding ways to get grants for people or following development in certain areas, or advising this Committee as far as where land use is going, etc. And yet the structure you're suggesting with basically two committees overseeing the activity of one department is brand new. Brandt questions, i.e. what part of Heidenreich's job is going to be overseen by this Committee? Lien commented that Brandt has history on his question as for years we had a Land Conservation Committee, a Zoning Committee, a coordinator position and we had joint meetings, so we had a very similar system with a "hybrid" committee. Now we are sort of going in a new direction, but with a similar process where the same staff is doing multiple different duties but you have two different committees. Fortunately, we have Schultz as a liaison between both committees as he is the Chair of the Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee so he has a good understanding of what we are doing. In terms of evolution, Schultz stated basically we are moving forward with the staff that we have in the County, who knows in a year or two however that Committee might develop it, there may be separate department with full time staff and a tourism director/coordinator. Upon Brandt asking if that Committee was discussing a full time coordinator now, Schultz said that was correct. Schultz said he is referring back to that no one knows where we are going to be at in two years. We may create a whole new department and segregate it from the DLM. More discussion took place on this subject. Zeglin stated the Exec. /Finance Committee and full County Board approved something to be interim/temporary with the idea that a Department would be chosen for Parks, Tourism and Economic Development. Zeglin said she cannot support anything permanent under Land Management. Zeglin and didn't think we should even be looking at having a temporary Economic Development person under the guise of the Land Management Department. Zeglin said she personally thinks that a Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee became the easy route in pushing everything on Land Management. Schultz said they are open to alternatives and he is also open to Exec. /Finance if they are

willing to let us know how much we can spend in creating a new department. Zeglin commented she thought they were supposed to develop a budget and take it to them and they can incorporate this. Schultz suggested creating two budgets; one for a totally segregated department, fully staffed. Zeglin knows the DLM staff worked extremely hard on Pietrek Park and should be commended on everything they've done as it has been absolutely fantastic and will continue to be but Zeglin does not want to see this as part of the DLM. Skoyen commented that putting Parks, Tourism and Economic Development together is kind of a big load under one umbrella. He could see parks fitting in under another department and perhaps through the winter time both departments could work on tourism and economic development or possibly the DLM handling the parks. Schultz commented we can just re-adopt the "interim" label. Schultz didn't think there was a deadline granted as to how long they apply "interim" status to the current structure that we have. Brandt understood the situation to be that you guys made a decision and you're bringing that recommendation to this Committee because, if in fact, that recommendation that you made is to happen we have to be onboard with that. Schultz commented that not liking the reality that we're facing is not the same thing as having alternatives and Schultz didn't see an alternative to our current structure and how to move forth. Schultz said a lot of the Committee time was literally just getting a lot of garbage behind us. Schultz didn't see another path at this point but he thought we have an outcome and that is to eventually have a standing department of Parks, Tourism and Economic Development. Schultz was open to anyone who has an alternative. Based on the recommendation of that Committee, Brandt asked Lien what his vision is. Lien said that when the resolution came out and it said "interim" we all think that is short term. Lien stated this Committee nor has our department acknowledged the amount of work that doesn't get done in this Committee, for that Committee, and when you take away the word "interim" and it becomes permanent then you have to acknowledge the amount of trade off of work. Lien said staff has been doing an outstanding job, and taking a lot of pride, in taking what was a little bit of problem child and making it better. The focus of that Committee has really been just cleaning up, kind of, past mistakes out there, so we haven't made a lot of progress forward but we've really built a solid foundation and staff takes pride in that. If it is going to stay in our Department, Lien said we; #1 - need additional help – which we are working through the budget or people need to be compensated for the extra work. We haven't asked for that, not even when the Committee approved it last month that was not related to the "interim" park duties. If that would become permanent work duties within this Department, even as an extra job, we have to acknowledge the additional work load. It is a lot of extra work for staff, camping there and helping out because the entire park is booked this coming weekend for Ashley for the Arts. We have "on the hour" patrol coming through and there will be a gator/Kubota dropped off to help with maintenance and patrol. Lien thought the DLM has a really good plan in place and staff has worked well with the Committee up to this point because this is the "big" event of the year. As Schultz said, Lien stated that we have looked at staff and where to put this and what other department this could be put in. The County is looking at taking on additional park land so it may become an even bigger work load. Discussions have been held about moving work duties around in the DLM along with the addition of new staff. Lien understood why it was offered to Land Management because of the work that Land Records, Surveying, etc. does. Lien explained that Tess Thompson and Budish went out to Pietrek Park and plotted out every lot so that we know where every lot sits. They painted in the grass so there is a numbering system. Lien thought things should go well this weekend as far as control/management but added that it takes a whole department. Arneson commented that there were originally 33 actual camp sites and we are now up to 69 sites plus the additional "group" five that we have so this is not just your normal 33 sites we have fully expanded the park. Lien added that last year it was 33 sites and a hayfield and this year it is 69 sites all plotted out plus we have overflow parking. In speaking for his staff, Lien said they do take pride in the progress that we have made with that. There is some satisfaction in doing aesthetic improvement in the County. Lien's point is that if it is going to stay with the DLM he wants the staff acknowledged for all their hard work and supported by this Committee financially for their hard work. Lien explained that he went to Personnel/Bargaining Committee and they tabled a majority of the pay requests because there is a newly, countywide, adopted step increase that is going to be implemented January 1st. Lien said that goes to everyone throughout the County. Lien said he didn't take that as a good resolution and that he would be presenting those back to Personnel/Bargaining later this month. If it is going to stay in the DLM, Lien reiterated that he would

like this Committee's support at the Personnel/Bargaining Committee for the wage increases that this Committee approved last month. Lien said we haven't even acknowledged the parks this is just additional duties (snowmobile trails, etc.,)that have been taken on. Lien said that Heidenreich's and Arneson's role are completely new. What Vickie Stalheim did in the past is nothing like what Arneson does today and what Judy Betker did is nothing like what Heidenreich does today as they have evolved into different positions and they should be paid accordingly for that. Brandt clarified that the issues that are before the Committee are; shall we, as a Committee, agree with the recommendation of the Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee to create another sub-department under the Department of Land Management with a full time coordinator position. Lien clarified that the coordinator position would be a permanent position with two LTE (Limited Term Employees) for the summer. Brandt added that the other thing, related to that, has to do with supporting job description changes and wage increases for those people who are taking on the responsibility of running, at this point, the parks and tourism and in the future possibly even talking to businesses who come to town. More discussion followed. Lien suggested melding together what has been said as Lien didn't think they want to create a whole different department and have a department head. They want someone to oversee this coordinator position. If that coordinator position was under Land Management and that coordinator picked up Economics and Tourism which would still work a lot with our staff and that person reported to the Economics and Tourism Committee and then have this Committee take Parks and still utilize staff however when they have a Economics and Tourism Committee, that person and perhaps Lien would attend. Lien stated what the DLM staff is planning to do with that park has a lot to do with this Committee, i.e. conservation and education. Lien said we are trying to grow and head in a little bit different direction and the Parks Committee supports that. Lien said there are going to be walking trails with possibly a classroom addition out there. All of those things which are great ideas related to conservation goals and education. When we start talking about economics and tourism that also has a lot to do with land management from the planning side of things and also land records but not necessarily this Committee. Lien suggested making a "hybrid" proposal based on what Zeglin, Skoyen and Schultz just said. Lien expressed appreciation to the E & LU Committee for acknowledging that we are one County with one goal. Lien thought past Committee's would not have supported as many work hours the staff has put into that park. Zeglin commented that if there is confusion as to what was envisioned for this Committee, she urged Schultz as Chair of the Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee to go before Exec./Finance just to clarify exactly what they want or what they had in mind or what the full County Board had in mind. Zeglin thought it should be reviewed before Schultz goes any further. As far as compensation, we approved that last month and we were all unanimous in that the staff should be given higher compensation for the stellar work that they do, even without the extra work load, so Zeglin knows we are fully behind that. If at all possible, Zeglin will attend the next Personnel/Bargaining Committee meeting. Zeglin continued that we agreed to those before hearing the presentation today. They work hard all the time and they deserve that and the original job descriptions have changed and there is much more responsibility than there was when their predecessors were on staff. Brandt thanked Schultz and that Committee for the new/re-development at Pietrek Park. Brandt added that Trempealeau County is dealing with the planning issue related to housing but also a change in generations in ways that people relate to the land and that requires more recreational opportunities whether it is biking, camping, fishing, snowmobiling, etc. and we are this interesting land between the cities. There are people from the Twin Cities who now regularly come to Elmaro Vineyards. They didn't used to go beyond Fountain City but they will come as far as Trempealeau now for recreational opportunities so you can't diminish the importance of tourism and economic development as well as the parks in this County and what this County looks like. If the Committee chooses not to fund this Committee and this new department, Brandt said we could be losing a lot more in terms of possible options from tax revenue and development if we don't have someone focusing on knowing where we are at. As a Department, Bawek asked if Lien had the "inside track" on getting some grants that a new department may not have where you can "spill over" into the park part of things. Lien replied that Heidenreich is working with Mississippi River Regional Planning and we're learning through them the grant process related to parks and that has opened some windows. According to Lien, the Park Committee applied almost every year and never obtained a grant because they haven't made a big focus on youth education. Youth education makes an

application score a lot higher and through planning, land records and working with Mississippi River Regional Planning, Lien thought we could make a pretty favorable grant application for this coming year. To answer Bawek's question, Lien said it would depend on who is hired and if they know those avenues they could also aid the parks but Lien didn't think that was a workload or duty that our department can absorb now as there has to be a new person hired to fill that void. For the sake of moving on, Lien said there isn't an action needed but asked that the Committee let Schultz and Lien keep them updated as to how that Committee progresses and take the ideas from today, work them into the budget and there may be a way that we can separate some of the duties but still have the connection under Land Management without adding a bigger work load to this Committee. Lien added that everything will depend upon what the Board supports for a budget because the budget has to increase. Arneson clarified that if we don't have a decision on this, we are still able to go forward with a budget with creating the two extra positions and the coordinator position. Lien responded yes, because that is under the Parks, Tourism and Economic Development Committee. Upon Arneson asking if this is two separate budgets that we will be dealing with or just one, Lien replied we will work on the one budget and if we have to separate out items we will do that but we will present one budget. Lien commented that he learned that we also have to add motor coach and tourism into this budget. Some discussion took place on the motor coach tours. Bawek asked if Schultz could speak to the additional park land that is being alluded to. Schultz replied there has been an offer by a landowner to make a park on multiple parcels within the County. At this point, Brandt addressed agenda item #14.

Buffalo County Bluff Prairie Tour – Kirstie Heidenreich

Heidenreich gave a presentation on the Buffalo County Bluff Prairie Tour that she and Tess Johnson went on last week. Heidenreich noted that Schultz was there as well. Buffalo County works with NRCS, DNR, UW-Extension and their Land Conservation staff. According to Heidenreich, they have started an amazing initiative to restore their bluff prairies. Heidenreich explained that bluff prairies are sometimes called goat prairies, but they are south facing bluffs that are dry and they need full sunlight and heat exposure. The soils are often really shallow so on the prairie you can actually see the bedrock right below the soil. The species that grow there are very unique and they flourish and need these conditions. There are over 100 plant species and 30 animal species that only appear in bluff prairies. Heidenreich showed some photos with the Committee. Heidenreich elaborated on some of the species that make their habitat in the bluffs. Heidenreich stated that 99% of the bluff prairies are gone so the 1% that we have left are rare gems and some of them are right here in Trempealeau County. Buffalo County has some also. To the people that look at these prairies and say, "What good is it?" Heidenreich quoted Conservationist Aldo Leopold who said, "If a land mechanism as a whole is good, then every part is good whether we understand it or not". Heidenreich stated it isn't just something that can be tossed aside, it is something that we have to value and we have to care for if we want to see them continue on. Some discussion took place on these prairies and their locations. In regard to Buffalo County restoring their bluff prairies, Heidenreich said they used some of their CAPX2020 funds. They authorized $75,000 to do that and then their Land Conservation Department (LCD) is taking in land owner applications and reviewing them on a case by case basis so if a private landowner wants to be involved their LCD requires that there be public access, upon request of the LCD, not necessarily at all times but mostly for educational purposes. The landowner also has to maintain the site for 10 years. Heidenreich added that maintenance is absolutely vital to these, obviously, otherwise they would just become overgrown again. The landowner also has to provide "in-kind" contributions which, often times, is labor and these bluffs are a labor intensive process. Heidenreich explained it is a 10 year program and Todd Mau who is the NRCS Conservationist in that area has been a huge advocate for this. According to Heidenreich, he has stated and also seen huge amounts of dollars coming in from other agencies and private landowners as well because once people really see the value in these, it all just comes together through a lot of team work. Heidenreich thought it was about $1500-$2000 an acre to "restore" these prairies and that can vary depending upon what is on the landscape. More discussion took place on the bluff prairies and funding available.

2017 DLM Budget

Lien presented and reviewed the 2017 DLM Budget with the Committee. Lien noted that we are approximately $68,000 under last year's budget due to staff turnover and Nick Gamroth's position change. For County cost-sharing, we were approved $47,000 in 2016. We are requesting $50,000 for 2017 in hopes that we can make that a constant. The last two years it wasn't approved at budget time and Lien got chastised for that when going before Exec. /Finance as they said Lien needs to budget for this. Upon Brandt asking if we would spend the $47,000, Lien responded he believed so but Carla Doelle would have that information. In regard to the Vehicle Fund, Lien explained that we bill ourselves for the use of our County vehicles, so from our different programs we charge back miles to them and that money goes into this fund. The replacement of vehicles is not levied and we typically try to trade every couple of years. We didn't trade last year so Lien is currently seeking bids for new vehicles plus we get government pricing. County Board policy says we have to get bids from all new car dealers in the County. Lien will get bids for two new vehicles (we currently have six) from those three dealers and then present the bids back to this Committee for a decision. Lien expressed that this is a good program and he has worked with the Sherriff, Human Services and the Health Dept. to try to adopt this same program to build up their vehicle fleet. Lien elaborated a little more on this program. Lien continued going through the budget with the Committee. Zeglin proposed that for the next budget cycle the Committee look into offering a scholarship or two for high school students from the County to attend Wisconsin Land & Water Conservation Camp. The camp is $250 per student for a whole week of camp. Zeglin thought it would be beneficial to promote conservation. Zeglin suggested having interested applicants submit an essay. Lien thought that could be done this year within the $3,500 that is already budgeted under the Tree & Shrub Account. More discussion took place. Since the camps were over for this year, it will be taken care of in the spring. Britzius made a motion to approve the DLM budget as presented, Skoyen seconded, motion carried with no opposition. Lien then went through the Land Records budget with the Committee. Lien noted because there are two new staff members there is an increase in this budget. Hempel explained the "retained fees" are the result of a State Statute which states that Land Records gets a set amount of income to help fund Land Records programs. Through those funds, Land Records pays a maintenance fee to Register of Deeds plus any other program expenses that may come up. Some discussion took place in regard to software training, etc. Killian made a motion to approve the Land Records budget as presented, Schultz seconded, motion carried with no opposition. Upon Brandt asking which Committee the Parks budget will be presented to, Lien responded the Parks, Tourism & Economic Development Committee and he, Arneson and Schultz will be presenting it.

LWRM (Land & Water Resource Management) and TRM (Target Runoff Management) Requests and Payment Approval

Lien presented the following payments for approval and noted these are non-levied amounts.

Land & Water Resource Management (LWRM)

Name	Type	Amount	New CSA Total	Reason for change	Town
Kevin Pronschinske	Contract	$12,936.00	$12,936.00	Nutrient Management	Burnside
Kevin Pronschinske	Pay Request	$12,936.00		Certify Nutrient Management	
Dan Guse	Contract	$17,511.29	$17,511.29	Nutrient Management	Hale
Dan Guse	Pay Request	$17,511.29		Certify Nutrient Management	

Targeted Runoff Management (TRM)

Name	Type	Amount	New CSA Total	Reason for change	Town
Theodore Imgrund	Contract	$40,988.93	$40,988.93	Streambank & Rip Rap	Pigeon
Theodore Imgrund	Pay Request	$40,988.93		Certify Streambank & Rip Rap	

Bawek made a motion to approve the contract and pay request as presented, Zeglin seconded. Motion to approve passed with no opposition.

Surveying Update and Payment Approval
Brandt referred the Committee to a report from County Surveyor Joe Nelsen. Nelsen has been maintaining monuments in the towns of Unity and Albion. Killian made a motion to approve the Surveyor report and payment request as presented, Britzius seconded. Motion to approve passed with no opposition. Lien noted that in regard to the Surveyor's budget there will be no additions or changes.

The next regular meeting date was confirmed as Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 9:00 AM. Brandt acknowledged this meeting as being Wade Britzius's last one with this Committee as he is resigning from the County Board due to a change in residency. The Committee thanked him for his service.

At approximately 12:30 PM, with the consensus of the Committee, Brandt adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Virginette Gamroth, Recording Secretary

Beth Killian, Secretary